

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 12 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1 -10 to compositions and structures have been canceled.

New claims 11 - 18 are written as method claims using the composition and structures of the previous claims 1-10.

Claim 11 is supported by original disclosure in original claims 1, 2, and 3; and for barrier properties to alcohol containing fuels on original disclosure on page 1, lines 28-30, and in the Examples – particularly in Table 1 in improved permeability resistance to methanol.

Claim 12 and 13 is supported by original claims 4 and 5.

Claim 14 is supported by original disclosure on page 24, lines 8-14.

Claim 15 is supported by original claim 7.

Claim 16 is supported by the Examples, tested in direct contact with methanol-containing fuel.

Claim 17 and Claim 18 are supported by original claims 8 and 9

35 U.S.C. §112, 1<sup>st</sup>

Claims 4, 5 and 10 have been cancelled.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)Jadamus in view of Nakajima and Chacko

Claims 1 and 4-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Jadamus et al et al, US 6,090,459, in view of Nakajima (US 5,376,712) and further in view of Chacko ( US 6,617,377).

As amended, Applicant's claims are now to a method for improving barrier properties of a structure to alcohol-containing fuels. The '459 reference fails to teach all of Applicant's claim limitations, and therefore fails to present a *prima facie* of obviousness. Specifically, the '459 reference fails to teach the use of

apolyamide/polyolefin blend having carbon nanotubes for use as a barrier layer for alcohol-containing fuels.


The '459 reference does disclose the use of carbon nanotubes in an electrically conductive inner layer of a multiplayer plastic pipe. There is no disclosure in the '459 reference that would teach or suggest a method for improving barrier properties to alcohol-containing fuels, as invented by Applicant. Indeed, the '459 reference teaches away from the use of a carbon nanotube containing layer as a barrier layer by stating in column 2, lines 14-17, and again in column 5, lines 1-6 that conventional barrier layers be present.

The '459 reference teaches the purpose of the nanotube-containing layer as an anti-static layer, and not as an alcohol-containing fuel barrier layer.

Neither the Nakajima or Chacko references describe any barrier layer properties of carbon-nanotube containing plastics, and therefore fail to heal the defects in the '459 reference to teach or disclose all of Applicant's claim limitations

Since the cited references fail to present a *prima facie* case of anticipation or obviousness over the claims as amended, Applicant believes that the reasons for rejection have been overcome, and the claims herein should be allowable to the Applicant. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Thomas F. Roland, Esq.  
Attorney for the Applicants  
Reg. No. 42,110

Date: January 12, 2007

Arkema Inc.  
Customer Number 31684